



IFW

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE			
<b>STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW</b>		Attorney Docket Number: 10517/270 PATENT	
Applicant Minobu MIZUNO	Application No. 10/527,994	Filing Date March 21, 2005	
Patent Number	Issued	Examiner Han Van PHAN	Art Unit 3618
Invention Title FUEL CELL EQUIPPED VEHICLE		Assignee TOYOTA JIDOSHA KABUSHIKI KAISHA	

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In compliance with M.P.E.P. 713.04, the Applicant provides this Statement of Substance of Interview concerning the personal interview conducted on December 12, 2006 with Examiner Phan.

- (A) Exhibits. No exhibit was shown or demonstration was conducted.
- (B) Claims.
- (C) Prior art. Riemer et al. (US 5,641,031)
- (D) Amendments. Proposed amendment to positively recite in the claim body that the fuel cell-equipped vehicle does not include a reformer.
- (E) Principal arguments of Applicant. Prior art does not disclose features according to proposed amendment.
- (F) Other matters. N/A
- (G) Results. N/A

Application Serial No.: 10/527,994

Attorney Docket No.: 10517/270


Although not believed necessary, the Office is hereby authorized to charge any fees required or credit any overpayments relating to this communication to Deposit Account No. 11-0600.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at 202-220-4323 to discuss any matter regarding this application.


Respectfully submitted,

KENYON & KENYON

Dated: DEC. 13, 2006

By:   
William E. Curry  
(Reg. No. 43,572)

KENYON & KENYON LLP  
1500 K Street, N.W.  
Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
(202) 220 - 4200 (telephone)  
(202) 220 - 4201 (facsimile)



## Interview Summary

Application No.

10/527,994

Applicant(s)

MIZUNO, MINOBU

Examiner

Hau V. Phan

Art Unit

3618

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Hau V. Phan. (3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) William Curry. (4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview: 12 December 2006.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Riemer et al.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: \_\_\_\_\_

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Riemer et al. in col. 3, lines 24-26, disclose the fuel cell system without reformer.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Hau V. Phan

Examiner's signature, if required